



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,222	03/22/2004	Mark R. Burns	22116-00011-US	9133

30678 7590 04/20/2006

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP  
SUITE 800  
1990 M STREET NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3425

EXAMINER

DESAI, RITA J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1625

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/805,222	BURNS, MARK R.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Rita J. Desai	1625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/30/06.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-7 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 1625

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1-3,5-15 are pending. Claims 11-15 are new.

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 112 second has been withdrawn since applicants have amended the claims to delete the term R from the claim.

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 112 first para for the term “prodrug” has been withdrawn since applicants have deleted the term, however the rejection now stands on claim 8-14 since applicants have amended claim 8 to insert the term “prodrug”.

The claims 1-7 rejected under 35 USC 102 over US 5162336 (WO9200295 has been withdrawn since applicants have deleted the term prodrugs however the same rejection is now made on claims 8-15 since applicants have amended the claims to include the term produgs.

#### **New grounds of rejection**

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 8-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for depression and anxiety , does not reasonably provide enablement for treating any and all neurological diseases. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and

Art Unit: 1625

whether any necessary experimentation is “undue”. These factors include 1) the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the level of predictability in the art, 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor, 7) the existence of working examples, and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

**1) The breadth of the claims:** The instant claims encompass compounds which are carboline derivatives.

**2) The nature of the invention:** The invention is a compound to treat anxiety and depression .

**3) The state of the prior art:** The state of the prior art is that the drugs and the enzymes react in a lock and key mechanism and the structure of the compound has to be specific. Even a difference of a methyl group verses a hydrogen changes the properties altogether. A good example is a theophylline verses caffeine . They differ by just a methyl group but one of them has a pharmaceutical use as a broncodialator. There is no absolute predictability and no established correlation between the different substitutions on a core that they would all behave in the exact same way. The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any therapeutic regimen on its face.

**4) The level of one of ordinary skill:** The ordinary artisan is highly skilled.

**5) The level of predictability in the art:** It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable , requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. In re Fisher, 427 F. 2d 833, 166 USPQ 18(CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. The level of unpredictability in the art is very high. The compounds which differ by a methyl group also show different properties, for e.g. theophylline and caffeine. One of them is a bronchodialator and they differ only by a methyl group.

**6) The amount of direction provided by the inventor:** The inventor provides very little direction in the instant specification. There are no examples with various groups or produrds for the compounds to be able to treat any and all the neurological diseases.

**7) The existence of working examples:** The only direction provided it to some data for the activity in treating anxiety and depression.

**8) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure:** Since there are no working examples, the amount of experimentation is very high and burdensome.

Taking the above eight factors into consideration, it is not seen where the instant specification enables the ordinary artisan to make and/or use the instantly claimed invention.

Genetech Inc Vs Nova Nordisk 42 USPQ 2d 1001.

“A patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search but compensation for its successful conclusion and patent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable.”

***Conclusion***

Claim 8-15 are not found to be allowable.

Claims 1-3, 5-7 are found to be allowable..

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rita J. Desai whose telephone number is 571-272-0684. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang can be reached on 571-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Rita J. Desai  
Primary Examiner

Application/Control Number: 10/805,222

Page 5

Art Unit: 1625

R.D.

April 17, 2006

Art Unit 1625

*R. Desai*  
4/17/06